

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,780	10/24/2001	Yasuo Kitaoka	10873.826US01	3107
7590 02/18/2004		EXAMINER		
Merchant & Gould P.C.			VY, HUNG T	
P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, N	IN 55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-			2828	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

→			12.15		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/041,780	KITAOKA ET AL.			
navious naudi	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hung T Vy	2828			
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same of this application applicati	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverser, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three models are part of the period of extensions. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE terms on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I36(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	* **	• •			
(a) They raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	• • •	•	and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other: PAUL IP					
		SUPERVISORY PAT TECHNOLOGY O	ent examiner		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argurement is not persuasive. The claim do not define efficiency feature of the second harmonic generation as set forth in pag 9 of the sp ciatication in ord r to g t the fundamental light and the harmonic light emitted from the optical waveguide because element 2 is a second harmonic g neraror whith can not produce fundamental wave. Instead element 2 can only produce harmonic wave. The claims are not patentable over Yamanoto et al. and Kitaoka et al.